

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
 San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

Academic Senate Executive Committee Agenda
Tuesday, January 6, 1987
 UU 220, 3:00-5:00 p.m.

<u>MEMBER:</u>	<u>DEPT:</u>	<u>MEMBER:</u>	<u>DEPT:</u>
Botwin, Michael	ArchEngr	Kersten, Timothy	Economics
Cooper, Alan	BioSci	Lamouria, Lloyd H.	AgEngr
Crabb, Charles	CropSci	Riener, Kenneth	BusAdm
Currier, Susan	English	Terry, Raymond	Math
Forgeng, William	MetalSci	Weatherby, Joseph	PoliSci
Gamble, Lynne	Library	Wheeler, Marylinda	P.E./RecAdm
Gooden, Reg	PoliSci	Wilson, Malcolm	Interim VPAA
Nancy Jorgensen	Cslg/Tstg	Copies: Baker, Warren J.	
		Irvin, Glenn W.	

all minutes removed

- I. Minutes:
 Approval of the November 18, December 2, and December 5, 1986 Executive Committee Minutes (attached pp. 3-13).
- II. Communications:
 December 2, 1986 Minutes to the President's Council Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocations (attached pp. 14-15).
- III. Reports:
 - A. President
 - B. Academic Affairs Office
 1. FTE Student Allocations
 2. Cooperative Education FTEF
 - C. Statewide Senators
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Items:
 - A. Resolution to Ensure Full Senate Discussion of Resolutions from Standing Committees-Rogalla, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (attached pp. 16-18).
 - B. Resolution on Honorary Doctorate for Burt Rutan, Aeronautical Engineering Class of '65-Forgeng, SENG Caucus Chair (to be distributed).
 - C. Resolution on Allocation of Lottery Funds-CSU, Sacramento (attached pp. 19-20).

VI. Discussion Items:

Need to move ahead with equity as it pertains to employment of women and minorities. Our talk of, and support for, the concept of equity is vigorous but adequate response in hiring is questioned. The question is one of implementation. Shall we charge our Status of Women Committee with the responsibility to recommend actions which **will** result in the employment of women and minorities? Dr. Haak at CSU, Fresno is quoted as follows in Fresno's Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes of September 22, 1986:

Dr. Haak indicated that CSUF could consider a type of flexible appointment for people who do not have their doctorate. He continued that one possibility would be the development of an internship with a screening process at the beginning that would encourage women and minorities, through the faculty affirmative action development program, to seek their doctorate with the understanding that once the doctorate was earned they would not have to go through a search again. Dr. Haak added that this would require a close interaction between the Faculty Affirmative Action Committee and the Personnel Committee. (See cover memo from the Chancellor to Presidents dated September 10, 1986, attached pp. 21-23).

VII. Adjournment:

RECEIVED

Minutes to the President's Council Advisory Committee
on Budgets and Resource Allocations

DEC 4 1986

December 2, 1986
Administration Room 133, 8:30 am

Academic Senate

Attendance: James Landreth (Chair), David Walch, Russell Brown, Jim Conway, Kevin Swanson, Doug Gerard

Staff Support: Rick Ramirez, Frank Lebens, Lorraine Howard

Guests: None

Apologies: Malcolm Wilson

1. Minutes of the November 25, 1986 Meeting were approved without change.
2. Correspondence received (copies attached):
 - a. Coded Letter APPS 86-39/BA 86-22, October 30, 1986 from William E. Vandament and D. Dale Hanner to Presidents, subject: Campus Proposals for Lottery Funded Faculty Mentoring Programs for Underrepresented Undergraduate Minority Students.
 - b. November 21, 1986 memo from Warren J. Baker to Jim Landreth, subject: FY 1986/87 Lottery Education Fund - Recommended Allocations for Non-Formula Instructional Equipment and Discretionary Allocations.
 - c. November 26, 1986 memorandum from Warren J. Baker to Louis V. Messner, subject: FY 1986/87 CSU Lottery Education Fund - Campus Discretionary Allocations.
 - d. November 26, 1986 memo from Warren J. Baker to Dr. Anthony J. Moyer and Mr. Louis V. Messner, subject: FY 1986/87 CSU Lottery Education Fund Instructional Development and Technology.
3. In a November 21, 1986 memo to Jim Landreth (see attached copy), President Baker commented on the allocation of funds for microcomputer workstations in relation to the proposed CSU Computing Support budget formulas. During the Advisory Committee's discussion, it was observed that the Final Design Report on the Computing Support budget formulas did not specify if the allocations of student workstations would be based on need (as determined by the proposed algorithm) or on the basis of the campus workstation deficit as compared to need. The latter approach would penalize campuses that have obtained donated equipment. It was also observed that the CSU Lottery allocation for Student Access to Instructional Computing (IS 86-28 and IS 86-27) specified that the funds are to be used to purchase 78 student workstations at Cal Poly.
4. FY 1986/87 CSU Lottery Fund Allocation for Instructional Development and Technology - Frank Lebens reported that President Baker's transmittal to Louis V. Messner and Anthony J. Moyer on Cal Poly's proposed allocations for Instructional Development and Technology (see attached copy) was delivered on December 1, 1986. These are the same three projects that the Advisory Committee recommended for approval during the November 25, 1986 meeting. The unallocated amount that resulted during that meeting was subsequently eliminated by increases in the proposed allocations for the Mathematics and

City and Regional Planning Departments. The proposed allocations are shown on the attachment to President Baker's November 26, 1986 memo. Campus allocations will be made after receipt of Chancellor's Office approval for these projects.

5. FY 1986/87 CSU Lottery Education Fund Allocations for Educational Equity/Faculty Mentoring - In APPS 86-39/BA 86-22 (see attached copy), the campuses were invited to submit proposals to the Chancellor's Office for campus programs on faculty mentoring for underrepresented undergraduate minority students. The Chancellor's Office intention is to fund six competitive pilot programs based on proposals that must be received by December 10, 1986. Student Academic Services and the Dean of Students are currently preparing a proposal that will be transmitted to the Advisory Committee for review during the Tuesday, December 9, 1986 meeting. The Cal Poly proposal will request funds for a Spring Quarter 1987 pilot project that will lay the ground work for the implementation of a faculty mentoring program during the 1987/88 academic year. This differs from the Chancellor's Office request for proposals in that the Chancellor's Office requested the implementation of mentoring programs during FY 1986/87.
6. CSU Lottery Education Fund Program Authorizations - The support staff was requested to develop a draft position paper on the allocation methodology and process for Program Authorizations. The current process allocates 60% of the Lottery Funds for Program Authorizations that are developed annually by the Chancellor's Office. The Authorizations are based on campus proposals submitted during February. Under the current procedure, the project authorizations are released to the campuses after the Trustees approve the Chancellor's Office proposals in July. As a consequence, the campuses receive insufficient time to plan, make local allocations, and implement projects within the fiscal year. Other problems with the process include the rather large number of program authorizations and the associated impact for all the parties involved and the apparent over lap between the projects. Support staff, with contributions from Advisory Committee members and other interested parties will, develop a draft position paper to propose an alternative process for CSU Lottery Program Authorizations. The intent is to submit a recommendation to President Baker that could then be transmitted to the Chancellor's Office.
7. FY 1988/89 Support Budget: Program Change Proposals - The next item on the CSU Support Budget preparation calendar is development of CSU Program Change Proposals for 1988/89. The Chancellor's Office normally requests campus input on Support Budget PCP's in February or March. During subsequent meetings, the Advisory Committee will review the local process for the development of PCP's for the Board of Trustees FY 1988/89 Support Budget Request. Attached for convenient reference are the approved PCP's for 1986/87 and the Trustees PCP request for 1987/88.
8. Dr. Walch, Interim Vice President for Information Systems announced that the newly appointed Vice President for Information Systems, Dr. Arthur S. Gloster will assume his duties on the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocations in January 1987. Dr. Walch will represent the Vice President for Information Systems on the Advisory Committee through December 1986.
9. Next Meeting: Tuesday, December 9, 1986, Administration Room 133, 8:30 to 10:00 am.

Adopted: _____

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background statement:

Concern has been expressed that the Executive Committee may be using its agenda setting responsibility to reduce full Senate discussion of resolutions from standing committees.

AS-____-86/____

**RESOLUTION TO
ENSURE FULL SENATE DISCUSSION OF
RESOLUTIONS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

- WHEREAS, The Executive Committee becomes an editing body when they refuse to agendize a standing committee resolution; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That all resolutions from standing committees be agendized for the next Senate meeting; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That resolutions be reported verbatim excepting obvious typographical errors.

Proposed By:
Constitution and Bylaws
Committee
November 18, 1986

NOV 17 1986

From: UNIV. OF
TOWSON
FACULTY SENATE

another envelope which bears the words "University Faculty Election," and the voter shall sign this envelope. All envelopes should be sealed. They shall be returned by interoffice mail or carried in person to the University mail room, where they shall be deposited in a locked box placed there by the Committee on Faculty Elections. Ballots must be returned no later than one week following the date of their distribution to the faculty. Failure to comply with any of these provisions shall result in the invalidation of a ballot.

3. The canvass of the vote shall consist of two stages. First, the outer envelopes of all ballots shall be checked for validity and the inner envelopes removed from them. Second, the inner envelopes shall be opened and the votes tabulated.
4. A description of the nomination and election procedures, together with the information contained in IV. 2, shall be distributed to the faculty with the ballots.

X v. Implementation and Reconsideration of Action taken by the Faculty Senate in the Name of the University Faculty

1. All recommendations and proposals approved in accordance with the CONSTITUTION and RULES of the Faculty Senate shall go into effect ten (10) days after such measures have been approved, subject to the provisions in this Article.
2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall distribute to the members of the University Faculty a copy of all such recommendations and proposals within three (3) days following their adoption. The Secretary also shall distribute to the members of the University Faculty a copy of any report prepared by a minority of the Senate and filed with the Secretary within said three (3) day period.
- X 3. The effective date of such measures may be postponed for thirty (30) days from the date of enactment if at least seventy-five (75) members of the University Faculty sign a petition requesting reconsideration of the same and file it with the Chairman of the Faculty Senate not later than ten (10) days following Faculty Senate action. The Chairman of the Senate shall immediately forward such petitions to the Chairman of the University Faculty. If the University Faculty should meet prior to the termination of this thirty-day period and approve the measures enacted by the Faculty Senate, they shall go into effect immediately upon the action of the University Faculty.
4. The University Faculty may rescind at any time any action taken by the Faculty Senate in the name of the University Faculty. However, such action taken by the Faculty Senate shall remain in effect, subject to the conditions stated above, until

repealed or modified by the Faculty Senate or rescinded by the University Faculty.

5. The quorum for any University Faculty meeting convened by petition for reconsideration of Senate action shall be 150 members of the University Faculty.

VI. Amendment

The Appendix to the Faculty Senate Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

RECEIVED

ACADEMIC SENATE

DEC 29 1986

Academic Senate



M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: December 17, 1986

TO: W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor
The California State University

FROM: Peter Shattuck, Chair
Academic Senate
California State University, Sacramento

SUBJECT: Allocation of Lottery Funds

On December 10, 1986, the Academic Senate of California State University, Sacramento unanimously adopted the following resolution. We urge you to give it your careful attention.

AS 86-87/Ex. LOTTERY FUNDS, ALLOCATION OF

Whereas, The people of California, in approving the State Lottery initiative, voted for "additional monies to benefit education" and for funds which "shall supplement the total amount of money allocated for public education in California," and

Whereas, The Office of the Chancellor, in devising procedures for the distribution of State Lottery funds within the CSU, has created a number of rigid categories, ignoring the specific needs of the nineteen campuses, and

Whereas, The Office of the Chancellor has requested the campuses to submit proposals for lottery funds, usually with unreasonably tight deadlines, and in some instances has simply aggregated proposals by categories without evaluating each one, and

Whereas, The repeated adoption of new and revised plans for allocating lottery money has resulted in extensive wasted effort and resultant anger and cynicism about the process, and

W. Ann Reynolds
Page 2
December 17, 1986

Whereas, The entire process distorts and violates the intent of the lottery initiative and damages basic educational purposes, and

Whereas, The best judges of the most effective use of lottery funds "to benefit education" are the individual campuses, therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Academic Senate, California State University, Sacramento,

1. That all lottery funds should be allocated to the individual campuses of the CSU on a uniform formula basis with no withholding of funds by the Office of the Chancellor;

2. That the only restrictions or controls imposed on the campuses in using these funds should be such as are required by law or are necessary for accounting and auditing purposes;

3. That any lottery funds not expended by a campus at the end of a fiscal year be available to that campus the following year, to allow for the prudent use of funds, including the accumulation of funds for larger projects; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor, to the Academic Senate, CSU, the Senates on each CSU campus, and to the Senators and Assemblymembers representing the California State University, Sacramento, service area in the California State Legislature.

PS/CD

cc: CSU Senate Chairs
Academic Senate, CSU

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

-21-

BAKERSFIELD CHICO DOMINGUEZ HILLS - FRESNO - FULLERTON - HAYWARD - HUMBOLDT
POMONA SACRAMENTO SAN BERNARDINO SAN DIEGO - SAN FRANCISCO - SAN JOSE



LONG BEACH - LOS ANGELES - NORTHRIDGE
SAN LUIS OBISPO - SONOMA - STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

(213) 590-

RECEIVED

September 10 1986
DEC 22 1986
1986

Academic Senate

MEMORANDUM

TO: Presidents

FROM: W. Ann Reynolds *W Ann Reynolds*

SUBJECT: Representation of Women in Mathematics, Sciences, and Engineering

Enclosed are two copies of the final report of the Task Force on Representation of Women in Mathematics, Sciences, and Engineering. The observations and recommendations found in the report are eminently worthwhile and deserve your close attention.

It is my desire that the campuses begin to incorporate the action plans suggested in the report into their on-going activities and programs. To this end, I suggest that you review the task force report in consultation with the campus academic senate and determine strategies appropriate to the characteristics of the campus for addressing the problems of underrepresentation of women in mathematics, sciences, and engineering.

For your information, Provost Vandament and Academic Affairs staff are exploring ways to establish model programs that would alert pre-service and in-service educators to the importance of creating a positive learning environment for young women enrolled in mathematics and science courses in junior high and high school.

Finally, I plan to have a discussion of the task force report during one of the Executive Council meetings later this fall. In the interim, should you have questions about the report, I suggest that you contact Dr. Vandament.

WAR/slw
Enclosures

cc: Dr. William E. Vandament
Dr. John M. Smart

7C M. Wilson - please handle, note requests of campuses report on our method of addressing this as a staff meeting

July 15, 1986

FINAL REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE
REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN IN MATHEMATICS,
SCIENCES, AND ENGINEERING

In January 1985, the Statewide Academic Senate of the California State University resolved to work with the Chancellor to appoint a special task force to investigate the underrepresentation of women faculty and women students in mathematics, sciences, and engineering. The task force was also charged with recommending specific remedies to the Chancellor and to the Board of Trustees should a finding of underrepresentation result.

The Task Force met over a period of ten months to study system-wide, state, and national data and to hear testimony from faculty women, state and national experts, affirmative action personnel, and directors of various professional associations and agencies. Task force members also reviewed and studied the current literature in the fields and various research reports by other institutions and agencies dealing with the same or similar problems. Subsequently, the Task Force was divided into subgroups to develop proposals for action plans in the following areas:

- a) K-8: teacher education/preparation
- b) 9-12: program for high school girls
- c) Regional centers to support CSU efforts
- d) CSU women students
- e) CSU women faculty

The format of the action plans includes specific proposals for action and assignment of responsibility for their implementation.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

- It is the unanimous conclusion of the Task force that there is a severe underrepresentation of women in the CSU in mathematics, sciences, and engineering and that this underrepresentation places the CSU in serious professional, ethical and legal jeopardy.
- The sources of the problem are so numerous and complex that the CSU cannot be held solely responsible. Nevertheless, the problem is so severe and the consequences so far reaching that immediate action must be taken.
- The underrepresentation is a manifestation of the cycle created by the interaction of socio-cultural forces and educational systems. This cycle needs to be broken.

- The extent and pervasiveness of the causes of the problem require cooperation and concerted action by all segments of the educational establishment and the community.
- Competent instruction and positive attitudes in the elementary and high schools are essential for providing girls with access to a broad spectrum of career opportunities when they begin working.
- The paucity of available data suggests that underrepresentation of female students and faculty has not been dealt with or perceived as an important issue. Research needs to be done and data need to be collected.

Adopted: _____

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background statement:

AS-____-86/____

RESOLUTION ON
HONORARY DOCTOR OF SCIENCE
DEGREE FOR BURT RUTAN

- WHEREAS, Burt Rutan, Class of 1965 in Aeronautical Engineering at California Polytechnic State University, has distinguished himself and Cal Poly by designing the "Voyager" aircraft that became the first aircraft to fly nonstop around the world without refueling on December 14 - 23, 1986; and
- WHEREAS, Mr. Rutan has for more than a dozen years been a worldwide leader in the design of fuel-efficient aircraft using novel approaches in aerodynamics and materials utilization; and
- WHEREAS, Mr. Rutan and his achievements serve as excellent examples of The California State University's aspirations for its diverse student body; and
- WHEREAS, It is fitting that The California State University suitably honor Mr. Rutan for his excellence and extraordinary achievement in this significant area of human endeavor; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the California Polytechnic State University Academic Senate strongly recommends to President Baker and the Trustees of The California State University that Burt Rutan be awarded an honorary Doctor of Science degree; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That this honorary degree be conferred at California Polytechnic State University's June 13, 1987 commencement.

Proposed By:
William Forgeng
January 6, 1987

ATTACHMENT 1

APPENDIX

INITIAL RELEASE OF FACULTY 1987-88 ACADEMIC YEAR

A. Process Used for Faculty Allocations: 1987-88 Academic Year

1. Mode and Level Productivity Ratios (Table 4, Column 2)

Ratios of student credit units (SCU's) taught per full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) position generated by mode and level formula are determined by the following procedure. The mode and level productivity ratios are determined utilizing the SCU and FTEF earned data from the 1985-86 Academic Year--the data which drives the 1987-88 budget and campus allocation.

- a. The data utilized for determining the productivity ratios are annual averages of SCU's taught. This requires determining a three-quarter average for each prefix for each mode and level of instruction used.
- b. The student credit units generated in each prefix are inserted into a mode and level matrix (Table 5) using adjusted normative ratios. This results in the production of the Summary by Classification and Level (SCAL), which was sent to each school July 31, 1986.
- c. The faculty positions earned from the mode and level matrix are calculated.
- d. The total SCU's taught for each school is divided by the total FTEF earned to produce the productivity ratios in Table 4, Column 2. It is important to realize that FTEF earned and not FTEF used is utilized in the productivity ratio calculation. This is done to avoid perpetuating a ratio based on overloads or underloads of faculty.

2. Projected Mode and Level FTEF Earnings (Table 4, Column 3)

A theoretical mode and level FTEF earning for the 1987-88 Academic Year was established by dividing the projected SCU's for the 1987-88 Academic Year by the productivity ratios from Table 4, Column 2. The SCU projection process is described in Section B found on Page 3 of this Appendix.

3. Compression to Budgeted FTEF (Table 4, Column 4)

The total theoretical mode and level FTEF earning for the 1987-88 Academic Year was higher than the FTEF positions available for release to the schools. As a result a campus compression to budget levels was necessary. Allocation areas 1 through 9 on Table 4 were reduced on a proportional basis to bring the subtotal of FTEF positions in Table 4, Column 4 to the level equal to the number of FTEF positions available for release. The compression factor was $850.1/829.6 = 0.9759$.

4. Adjustment of Faculty Release (Table 4, Column 5)

The actual release of faculty positions required adjustment to prevent layoff of tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Schools of Agriculture and Science and Mathematics. The School of Agriculture required 7.9 more FTEF positions than indicated in Table 4, Column 4 and the School of Science and Mathematics required 4.4 more FTEF positions. This augmentation had to come from the budgeted positions and required a reduction in the allocations to the other areas of campus.

A basic premise in making the reductions in other areas was that none of them should receive a decrease in the initial release which would put them below the amount received in 1986-87. As a result of applying a campus-wide proportional reduction, three areas would have received a decreased allocation, and were therefore frozen at the 1986-87 FTEF allocation level. These were Cooperative Education and the Schools of Architecture and Environmental Design and Liberal Studies. This action provided 4.4 of the 12.3 required augmentation positions. The remainder of the positions (7.9) came from a proportional reduction of Athletics and the Schools of Business, Engineering, and Professional Studies and Education using a compression factor of 0.9763.

The release numbers in Table 4, Column 5 reflect these adjustments and comprise the faculty release for the 1987-88 Academic Year.

5. Projected SCU/FTEF Ratios (Table 4, Column 6)

The projected 1987-88 SCU/FTEF ratios were calculated by dividing the projected 1987-88 SCU's from Table 4, Column 3 by the 1987-88 release of positions from Column 5. The projected ratios are higher than the 1985-86 productivity ratios in Column 2 because of the difference in methods of determination. The ratios in Column 2 are derived from actual SCU production and FTEF earned by mode and level, while the ratios in Column 6 are derived from projected SCU's and FTEF to be used. Historically the Column 6 projections have been higher than actual practice.

6. Net Release Change

The net release change in Table 4, Column 7 is calculated by subtracting the 1986-87 initial release of positions in Column 1 from the 1987-88 initial release of positions in Column 5. This will show changes from this year to next in initial release; however, any supplemental allocations made during the current academic year will not be reflected.

7. Cooperative Education

The Chancellor's Office has agreed to fund Cooperative Education out of the general fund and has increased the budgeted campus FTE allocation for 1987-88 by 100 non-capacity FTE. The funding comes at the average productivity ratio for the campus (255 SCU's/FTEF). Cooperative Education FTE therefore generate 5.9 FTEF for 1987-88. The funding

level for Cooperative Education was frozen at the same level as for 1986-87 (5.0 positions). For 1987-88 these positions are not drawn from resources generated by other areas, and Cooperative Education is now a positive net generator of faculty positions. In future years the faculty staffing generation will be determined by the mode and level of the Cooperative Education classes. This will result in more faculty positions for the campus since most of the SCU's will be taught in an upper-division S-36 classification with an adjusted normative ratio of 90.

B. Process Used for Projection of SCU's: 1987-88 Academic Year

1. Data Utilized for Projections

Data on numbers of Fall Majors, Fall Continuing Students, and Academic Year FTE were collected by school from 1970 through Fall Quarter 1986. These data were utilized for projection of Fall Continuing Students and Academic Year FTE.

2. Projection of Continuing Students: Table 1

Regression equations were developed which related the total enrollment from the previous fall quarter to the number of continuing students in the next fall quarter. For example, the total enrollment in Fall Quarter 1985 was related to the continuing student enrollment in Fall Quarter 1986. The regression equations selected for the schools were those that made sense in terms of the data related and which had the highest correlation coefficients. The regression equations and the estimated Fall Quarter 1987 continuing student numbers are shown in Table 1.

3. Projection of Total Enrollment to Produce 14,200 FTE: Table 3

The total enrollment required to produce 14,200 FTE for the 1987-88 Academic Year was derived from a regression equation relating total fall enrollment to Academic Year FTE. The regression equation is shown in Table 3. The total enrollment in the equation is 15,539. This number is divided by the factor 0.982 which is used by the Chancellor's Office to calculate Academic Year FTE from Fall Quarter FTE to determine the fall quarter target for total enrollment. The result is a target enrollment of 15,825, as is shown on Page Two of Table 2.

4. Projection of Enrollment Targets by School: Table 2

The proposed enrollment targets in Table 2 are arrived at through a combination of processes and information. The continuing student projections are from Table 1, the new graduate student targets are arrived at by examination of the past pattern and discussions with the various school deans, the returning undergraduate and graduate targets are estimates based on past years data, and the new undergraduate student targets are set after the campus and school total enrollments are set. The school total enrollment targets are set by looking at past

enrollments, student demand, employment opportunities, availability of programs in the CSU, facility limitations, and program commitments. The total enrollment targets are discussed and voted upon by the Dean's Council. The current targets were unanimously approved at the December 15, 1986 Dean's Council meeting.

5. Estimation of Academic Year FTE: Table 3

Regression equations have been developed to relate student enrollments in fall quarter to academic year FTE (Table 3). Once the regression equations are selected, the enrollment targets from Table 2 are utilized in the equations to estimate the Academic Year FTE for 1987-88 (Table 3). The estimated Academic Year FTE were converted to SCU's by multiplying the estimate from Table 3 by 15, and these values are reflected in Table 4, Column 3.

The School of Professional Studies and Education SCU total was handled somewhat differently because the data for the regression equation included the FTE taught in Military Science and Athletics. Estimates of the FTE production in those two departments was made by looking at the most recent academic year and then subtracting those estimates (240 SCU's and 660 SCU's respectively) from the projection for the School of Professional Studies and Education.

The SCU projection for Cooperative Education was set at a level that would provide 5.0 FTEF for the 1987-88 Academic Year. This maintains the support at the level provided in the 1986-87 Academic Year.

Institutional Studies: 1-5-87

Table 1.
ESTIMATED CONTINUING STUDENTS BY SCHOOL FOR FALL 1987
CAL POLY, SLO

Schools		Reported Fall 86 Majors	Regression Equations (14 Years of Data)		² R	S.D.	Est. Fall 87 Cont.
1.	Agriculture	3,399	-176.9 + 0.801	Prior Fall Majors	90.9	115	2,546
2.	Arch & Env Des						
	Arch	783	113 + 0.620	Prior Fall ARCHT	69.3	48	598
	Other	716	110 + 0.604	Prior Fall OTHERT	96.6	15	542
							1,140
3.	Business	1,550	-61.8 + 0.832	Prior Fall Majors	93.1	46	1,228
4.	Liberal Arts	1,602	-667 + 1.219	Prior Fall Majors	73.3	67	1,286
5.	Engineering	3,712	-563 + 0.959	Prior Fall Majors	97.4	91	2,997
6.	Prof Stu & Ed	2,793	-10473 + 8.231 -0.00134 + 202.7	Prior Fall Majors Prior Fall Majors ² GEB84	71.2	69	2,266
7.	Science & Math	1,320	180 + 0.572 +61.6	Prior Fall Majors GEB81	71.0	34	997
Campus by School		15,875			Sum		12,460
Campus Total		15,875	-2961 + 0.948 + 219.7	Prior Fall Majors GEB83	97.2	201	12,308

Table 2.
PROPOSED ENROLLMENT TARGETS BY SCHOOL, CAL POLY SLO,
REPORTED FALL 1983-1986; PROPOSED FALL 1987

Page 1 of 2

Schools and Factors		1983	Reported Fall 1984	1985	Fall 1986 Census	Fall 1986 Targets	Fall 1987 Proposed
<u>Agriculture (With D & FA)</u>							
1.	New UG	836	898	758	765	882	844
2.	New Grad	32	43	38	34	40	40
3.	Ret UG & G	62	61	44	68	45	60
4.	Continuing	2,787	2,695	2,649	2,532	2,623	2,546
5.	% of Prior Fall	75.5	72.5	71.6	72.6	75.2	74.9
6.	Total Enroll	3,717	3,697	3,489	3,399	3,590	3,490
<u>Arch & Env Des</u>							
1.	New UG	308	311	321	284	277	320
2.	New Grad	34	31	25	14	30	20
3.	Ret UG & G	13	11	10	26	10	20
4.	Continuing	1,135	1,163	1,209	1,175	1,178	1,140
5.	% of Prior Fall	81.3	78.0	79.7	75.1	75.3	76.1
6.	Total Enroll	1,490	1,516	1,565	1,499	1,495	1,500
<u>Business</u>							
1.	New UG	313	289	259	212	212	252
2.	New Grad	23	40	48	49	45	50
3.	Ret UG & G	25	18	20	18	20	20
4.	Continuing	1,151	1,224	1,296	1,271	1,253	1,228
5.	% of Prior Fall	81.7	81.0	82.5	78.3	77.2	79.2
6.	Total Enroll	1,512	1,571	1,623	1,550	1,530	1,550
<u>Liberal Arts (-GRC)</u>							
1.	New UG	324	367	283	242	223	204
2.	New Grad	12	10	8	4	10	5
3.	Ret UG & G	29	22	22	36	25	30
4.	Continuing	1,121	1,160	1,262	1,320	1,232	1,286
5.	% of Prior Fall	74.8	78.1	80.9	83.8	78.2	80.3
6.	Total Enroll	1,486	1,559	1,575	1,602	1,490	1,525
<u>Engineering (-IT, +CSC)</u>							
1.	New UG	679	801	728	663	717	638
2.	New Grad	33	37	34	37	40	50
3.	Ret UG & G	28	32	36	34	35	35
4.	Continuing	2,798	2,803	2,905	2,978	2,908	2,997
5.	% of Prior Fall	78.2	79.2	79.1	80.4	80.7	80.7
6.	Total Enroll	3,538	3,672	3,703	3,712	3,700	3,720

Table 2.
PROPOSED ENROLLMENT TARGETS BY SCHOOL, CAL POLY SLO,
REPORTED FALL 1983-1986; PROPOSED FALL 1987

Page 2 of 2

Schools and Factors	1983	Reported Fall		Fall 1986 Census	Fall 1986 Targets	Fall 1987 Proposed
<u>Prof. Stu & Ed (-D & FA, +G.C., +IT)</u>						
1. New UG	454	499	471	355	282	249
2. New Grad	81	114	135	124	140	160
3. Ret UG & G	43	50	39	54	45	50
4. Continuing	1,961	1,989	2,132	2,260	2,043	2,266
5. % of Prior Fall	74.6	78.3	80.4	81.3	73.6	81.2
6. Total Enroll	2,539	2,652	2,777	2,793	2,510	2,725
<u>Science & Math (-CSC)</u>						
1. New UG	310	315	334	232	264	278
2. New Grad	21	14	14	21	15	20
3. Ret UG & G	18	15	20	21	15	20
4. Continuing	979	956	1,040	1,045	1,006	997
5. % of Prior Fall	76.0	72.0	80.0	74.2	71.4	75.6
6. Total Enroll	1,328	1,300	1,408	1,319	1,300	1,315
<u>Campus Totals</u>						
1. New UG	3,224	3,480	3,154	2,753	2,857	2,815
2. New Grad	236	289	302	284	320	315
3. Ret UG & G	218	209	191	257	195	235
4. Continuing	11,932	11,990	12,493	12,580	12,243	12,460
5. % of Prior Fall	77.0	76.7	78.2	77.9	75.9	78.5
6. Total Enroll	15,610	15,967	16,140	15,875	15,615	15,825
7. Fall FTE (ERS)	14,397	14,694	14,650	14,430	14,281	14,460
8. Average Units	13.82	13.80	13.62	13.63	13.68	13.71
9. AY FTE (ERS)	14,168	14,444	14,378	(14,170)	14,200	14,200
10. Ratio AY/Fall	0.984	0.983	0.982	0.982	0.982	0.982

Table 3.
ESTIMATED AY FTE FROM FALL MAJORS BY SCHOOL, CAL POLY, SLO
FOR 1987-88

Schools		Est. Fall 1987 Majors	Revised Regression Equations Based on Acad. Reorganization (13 Years of Data)		2 R	S.D.	Est. 1987-88 FTE
1.	Agriculture	3,490	$76.2 + 0.527$ $- 202$	Fall Majors GEB83	94.3	52	1,713
2.	Arch & Env Des	1,500	$2733 - 11.27$ $+ 0.0216$ $- 0.000013$	Oth SAED FMaj ^(48%) Oth SAED FMaj ² Oth SAED FMaj ³	58.6	27	964
3.	Business	1,550	$361 + 0.608$ $+ 62.8$	Fall Majors GEB81	88.8	40	1,366
4.	Engineering	3,720	$-80.4 + 0.598$ $+ 111$	Fall Majors GEB81	97.2	64	2,255
5.	Liberal Arts	1,525	$-72.7 + 1.09$ $+ 0.495$ $+ 291$	LA Fall Majors PS & E Fall Majors GEB83	89.8	55	3,229
6.	Prof Stu & Ed	2,725	$667 + 0.232$ $+ 0.178$ -15.3	PS & E Fall Majors AG Fall Majors GEB83	58.1	59	1,905
7.	Science & Math	1,315	$-13.3 + 0.408$ $+ 0.919$ -209	S & M Fall Majors PS & ED Fall Majors GEB84	83.9	86	2,818
Campus		15,825				Sum	14,228
Campus Total		15,539	$3,929 + 0.661$	Fall Majors	94.3	140	14,200

**TABLE 4. DATA FOR 1987-88 RELEASE OF FACULTY POSITIONS
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO,**

		1 1986-87 Release of Positions	2 Ratios From Mode & Level Matrix 1985-86 SCU	3 Calculated 1987-88 FTEF Using Col 2 Ratios	4 Compression to Budgeted FTEF Col 3 X 0.9759	5 1987-88 Release of Positions ^c	6 Projected 1987-88 SCU/FTEF Ratios	7 Net Release Change Col 5 - Col 1
1.	SAGR	123.9	226	SCU 25695 FTEF 113.7	111.0	118.9	216	-5.0
2.	SAED	84.8	164	SCU 14460 FTEF 88.2	86.0	84.8	171	+0.0
3.	SBUS	58.5	312	SCU 20490 FTEF 65.7	64.1	62.6	327	+4.1
4.	SENG	143.1	216	SCU 33825 FTEF 156.6	152.8	149.2	227	+6.1
5.	SLA	140.5	329	SCU 48435 FTEF 147.2	143.7	140.5	344	+0.0
6.	SPSE	101.7	258	SCU 27675 ^b FTEF 107.3	104.7	102.2	271	+0.5
7.	SSM	155.0	274	SCU 42270 FTEF 154.3	150.6	155.0	273	+0.0
8.	COOP	5.0	254 ^a	SCU 1300 FTEF 5.1	5.0	5.0	260	+0.0
9.	ATHLETICS	10.5	55	SCU 660 FTEF 12.0	11.7	11.4	58	+0.9
SUBTOTALS		823.0		SCU 214810 FTEF 850.1	829.6	829.6		+6.6
10.	UNIV HEALTH EMERGENCY	2.5				2.5		
11.	UNIV ASSIGNED TIME	3.4				3.5		
12.	RESERVE	5.0				4.0		
TOTALS		833.9	254			839.6		

Institutional Studies: WRM: 12-10-86: FACREL.87

^a Cooperative Education is funded at the University SFR (254) for the 1987-88 Academic Year.

^b SPSE SCU's are calculated from Table 3 less Athletics (660) and Military Science (240).

^c Augmentations were required to SAGR (7.9) and SSM (4.4) to prevent layoff. SAED and SLA were held at the 1986-87 allocation level while SBUS, SENG, SPSE, and ATHLETICS were reduced by a factor of 0.9763 to provide the required positions.

Table 5. MODE AND LEVEL MATRIX

SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT: _____ TIME PERIOD: _____

APPLICATION OF STUDENT CREDIT UNITS BY MODE AND LEVEL
TO SYSTEM ADJUSTED NORMATIVE RATIOS

	<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>UD</u>	<u>G</u>
1.	C1-C2 Lecture, Lecture Discussion	<u>540</u> =	<u>394</u> =	<u>189</u> =
2.	C3-C6 Recitation, Seminar	<u>319</u> =	<u>270</u> =	<u>189</u> =
3.	C7-C14 Activity	<u>227</u> =	<u>200</u> =	<u>113</u> =
4.	C15 Laboratory 1	<u>178</u> =	<u>146</u> =	<u>92</u> =
5.	C16 Laboratory 2	<u>130</u> =	<u>103</u> =	<u>81</u> =
*				
7.	C18 Major Sport	<u>43</u> =		
8.	C19 Minor Sport	<u>86</u> =		
9.	C20 Workshops, Productions	<u>86</u> =	<u>86</u> =	<u>86</u> =
10.	C21 Major music performance	<u>173</u> =	<u>173</u> =	<u>173</u> =
*				
12.	S25 Supervision	<u>140</u> =	<u>140</u> =	<u>75</u> =
13.	S36 Supervision	<u>90</u> =	<u>90</u> =	<u>75</u> =
*				
16.	C78 Nontraditional	<u>540</u> =	<u>540</u> =	<u>540</u> =

* C17, S12, S48 not currently used at Cal Poly.
C77 not State supported.

MWW:10-81

TOTALS

AVE. SCU'S =

GRAND TOTALS =